



CITY OF MORGAN HILL

17555 PEAK AVENUE MORGAN HILL CALIFORNIA 95037

Website Address: [www.morgan-hill.ca.gov](http://www.morgan-hill.ca.gov) / Email: General@ch.morgan-hill.ca.gov

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

### SPECIAL MEETING

APRIL 17, 2001

**PRESENT:** Kennett, Lyle, Mueller, Ridner

**ABSENT:** McMahon, Pinion, Sullivan

**LATE:** None

**STAFF:** Community Development Director (CDD) Bischoff, Planning Manager (PM) Rowe, and Minutes Clerk Johnson.

### SPECIAL MEETING

Chair Kennett called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

### DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Minutes Clerk Johnson certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

### OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Kennett opened the public hearing.

There being none present who wished to address the Commission, the public hearing was closed.

### NEW BUSINESS:

**1. GPA-98-02/  
ZA-01-06: CITY**

This proposal involves a comprehensive update of the City's general plan. The Update involves reorganization and revisions to all but the Housing element of the existing

**OF MH-GENERAL  
PLAN UPDATE &  
REZONINGS**

General Plan. The update also includes a series of General Plan land use designation changes and rezonings. A draft Master Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to evaluate the potential environmental consequences of the proposed Update to the City's General Plan and associated rezonings.

Chair Kennett opened the public hearing.

CDD Bischoff presented the staff report. He noted that three specific applications were under consideration - amendment to the General Plan, zoning of effected properties and the master Environmental Impact Review (EIR). The housing element was not being addressed at this time.

CDD Bischoff noted that the draft Plan had been prepared by the General Plan Task Force (GPTF), consisting of members of the City Council, the Planning Commission and the public. In order to ensure the draft Plan represented community values, targeted public meetings had been held: Community Visionary Hearing, open meetings (hearings) by the General Plan Task Force, joint informational meetings of the City Council and the Planning Commission. A Community Attitudes Survey - seeking information about what the community likes, what needs improvement - for potential (draft) General Plan revision, has been conducted. Further, Staff prepared a newsletter for general information and encouragement of participation.

CDD Bischoff sketched the proposed hearing schedule, saying public comments would be received during the evening. Thirteen comments have been received and provided to the Commissioners at the time of the meeting.

Further explaining the process, CDD Bischoff indicated that the evening's meeting will: -  
Summarize the Draft General Plan for the Commissioners and the public, with emphasis on the EIR,  
-Provide for public input, and  
-Give Commissioners an opportunity to comment on the document and provide guidance to staff in the Planning Department as to clarification and potential recommendations.

Discussion followed regarding specific items in the document, including: recommendation of the GPTF on small lots; sizes of multi-family lot sizes of 3,500 s.f; and review of public facilities.

Paul Crawford, Chief Consultant, Crawford, Multari, and Clark, who contracted with the City for updating the General Plan, provided the history and updates of the General Plan revision process. He explained the seven topics (elements/chapters) of the General Plan and the process by which recommendations for changes are made. Specifically noted was the 25-year plan for orderly growth of residential properties; the need for specific service areas; and the recommendation for industrial development set-asides (122 acres on the east side of Hwy 101 near Diana Avenue, and 175 acres west of Highway 101 on the south side of Tennant Avenue.

As Mr. Crawford addressed the traffic issues associated with the Draft General Plan, he was asked to explain the levels of service (D and E) anticipated from the study. CDD Bischoff provided information which clarified the problems of projecting traffic numbers for through

(commuter) traffic, noting that published reports indicate increased traffic from cities to the south continuing to have large impacts on connector roads located in and near the City. Discussion continued on the traffic issues as topics of right-of-way costs, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), and proposed public transportation improvements were mentioned. The concern of the greenbelt areas was also discussed.

Erin Banks, EIR Consultant for Design, Community and Environment, addressed the Commission, providing information regarding the process of including EIR elements into the Draft General Plan. She stated that future projects are evaluated in a Master EIR. It was explained that while a Master EIR is a blueprint, there will be a need to look at specific site impacts at the time projects are ready for construction.

Commissioners called attention to the need to look at specific environmental issues, such as water storage, and urged specific plan development to replace generalized statements in the Draft EIR. Ms. Banks responded that the EIR recommendations were just that - and not policy. CDD Bischoff agreed, stating that Staff could have latitude in developing policies and address specific items as warranted.

Commissioners indicated that particular items such as: historical buildings; item A,B,a6 (page 53) housing needs determination; and (page 79) landfill capacity should be given more in-depth study for clarification.

Chair Kennett opened the public hearing.

Fredric Domino, PO Box 5, address the Commissioners referencing a letter delivered to the Planning Department with copies for all Members, in which he requested inclusion of his property into the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). He indicated that he represented a nearby neighbor with the same request.

Nick Johnson, 17470 Murphy Ave., spoke in opposition to the proposal of Industrial Development designation on the 122 acres near his home. He cited concerns of increased traffic, a nearby high school and a new park in the area. He said the Industrial Development designation had the potential for detrimental impacts on the existing neighborhood. Mr. Johnson suggested that business and industrial development might be better placed in Gilroy.

Mary Johnson, 17470 Murphy Ave., echoed the statements of the prior speaker, additionally referencing the potential for increased traffic in the residential area. She questioned where a buffer (greenbelt) zone would be if the Industrial Development designation were in place.

Gordon Jacoby, PMB 348 6114 LaSalle Ave, Oakland, presented written remarks to the Commissioners which he referenced. He noted that a shortage of Industrial/Business zoning within five - seven years.

Rick Finamore, 1370 James Ct., spoke in opposition to the proposal of Industrial Development category on the 122 acres near his home. He indicated alarm regarding the possibility of

increased traffic and the impact on use of Nordstrom Park. He said the Industrial Development designation had the potential for destructive repercussions on the neighborhood.

With no other persons present wishing to speak to the matters, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioners asked that specific items (listed below) of the Draft General Plan be given attention and/or clarification by the Consultants and Staff before or at the next meeting.

Circulation element

Cochrane Road/Monterey to Peet - differences in information presented on Page 67 as differs from that on page 62

Page 68 - Cochrane - Peet to Malaguerra

Page 69 - need to include Condit Road / on map page 63, Condit north of Main is seen as a minimum collector road, but data does not indicate collector standards  
Potential Industrial designation east of Highway 101 at Tennant.

Page 64 the need for greater, more accurate detail of standards in the Table

Page 25, clarity for population growth (box illustration)

Page 25, clarification in city limits and UGB

Page 29 Policy 7N, single lot subdivision, RPD necessary; document unclear on procedures

Page 29 8C need for specificity for educational facilities, e.g., K-12, secondary schools; need to eliminate any confusion in the education facilities language

At that point in the discussion, Commissioners agreed that specific questions of the Draft General Plan would be directed in writing to Staff to be addressed at the next meeting, May 15.

CDD Bischoff was asked to clarify the difference between UGB and the sphere of influence . He also provided descriptions of properties proposed by the GPTF for inclusion into the UGB, while noting some requests for inclusion which had not been adopted by the GPTF.

CDD Bischoff further advised how the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) affects planning within the General Plan elements such as housing, traffic, and air quality.

Responding to quoted language of the Draft General Plan, CDD Bischoff said it is important that the document provide an accurate reflection of the language of Measure P. The reason, he disclosed, is that it is essential for the public to be able to look at and understand the limitations of Measure P as it relates to the General Plan - and to know that Measure P can't be changed without a public vote.

Noting that considerable work will be required of Staff to "fine tune" the Draft General Plan, it was decided that the proposed meeting schedule will be: May 15 and May 29.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Chair Kennett expressed the thanks of all the Commissioners to the Consultants and Staff

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

APRIL 17, 2001

PAGE -5-

---

for their hard work, and to the citizens attending the meeting for their interest.

**ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:** There being no others wishing to speak, Chair Kennett adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m., continuing the public hearing to May 15, 2001.

**MINUTES RECORDED AND PREPARED BY:**

---

JUDI H. JOHNSON  
Minutes Clerk

C:\WINDOWS\TEMP\PC041701\_Min.wpd